

## REMARKS

### Amendment of the drawings

Figs. 4 and 6 are amended to correct the hidden lines depicting edges of the airflow channel (32 and 62). Fig. 4 is identified in the original specification as a side view of Fig. 3. The straight edges of the airflow channel (32 and 62) are, by this amendment, made consistent with the airflow channel (32) depicted in Fig. 3. No new matter has been added.

### Amendment of the specification and claims

The specification and the claims have been amended to replace the term "hole" with the term "airflow channel," because "airflow channel" is better descriptive of the structure of the invention. No new matter has been added.

### Election

Responsive to the restriction notice dated June 27, 2005 received in the above application, Applicant hereby elects the claims of species I. The claims of species I are claims 1-8. These claims are to be maintained in this application for examination.

Applicants reserve all rights to the non-elected subject matter.

The election is made with traversal, as follows.

### Traversal

The restriction of claims pertaining to embodiments (species) I-IV is respectfully traversed. Initially, it must be noted that Figs. 3 and 4 illustrate the same, not different, embodiments of the invention. Fig. 4 is identified in the original specification as a side view of the embodiment of Fig. 3. By the present amendment, Fig. 4 is corrected to show the airflow channel, consistent with Fig. 3, having straight sides. Thus, restriction between Figs. 3 and 4 is improper because these figures each illustrate the same embodiment.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the claims in the pending application define the same essential characteristics of the embodiment of Fig. 3. As indicated in MPEP 806.03, restriction between claims that define the same essential characteristics of an embodiment should never be required. This is because the claims in the pending application are but different definitions of the same disclosed subject matter, varying in breadth or scope of definition.

It is respectfully submitted that, because the claims of the pending application define the same essential characteristics of the same embodiment of Fig. 3, there is no undue burden placed on the Examiner in examining the claims. As stated in MPEP 803, if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

In each of the embodiments illustrated, the same essential characteristics of the invention exist. An airflow channel is defined between the top surface and the bottom surface of the main body of an electronic apparatus, and the bottom of the electronic device is supported to allow a natural convection of airflow, underneath the main body of the electronic apparatus and through the airflow channel.

With respect to Figs. 3 and 5, both of the embodiments shown in figures 3 and 5 are based on the same inventive idea, wherein only the locations of the airflow channels are different. As described in paragraph [0039] of the specification, "the location of the airflow channel is not limited." For example, the airflow channel can be located at the center of the main body of the electronic apparatus, as shown in figure 3, or located at one side of the main body, as shown in figure 5.

Similarly, with respect to Figs. 3 and 6, both of the embodiments shown in figures 3 and 6 are based on the same inventive idea, wherein only a means for supporting the main body to provide for airflow underneath the main body and into the airflow channel is different. For forming a convective airflow through the airflow channel provided in the main body of the electronic apparatus, there must exist an air entrance near the bottom of

the electronic apparatus, so that the air can enter the airflow channel and flow up through the airflow channel. Accordingly, space is provided between the bottom surface of the main body and the surface on which the electronic apparatus is placed. Therefore, a supporting device is provided on the bottom surface of the main body. In figure 3, the supporting device is comprised of feet or protrusions extending downward from the bottom surface of the main body. As shown in Fig. 6, the supporting structure is comprised of curved structure of the bottom surface of the main body itself. Thus, the embodiments of both figure 3 and figure 6 are based on the same inventive idea, wherein the space between the bottom surface of the main body and the surface on which the electronic apparatus is placed is provided by either the supporting device or the curved structure of the bottom surface of the main body.

It is respectfully submitted that, because all of the claims in the pending application define the same essential characteristics of the embodiment of Fig. 3, and because there is no undue burden placed on the Examiner in examining all of the claims, the restriction requirement of embodiments (species) I-IV be withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176  
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: July 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



JUSTIN J. CASSELL  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 46,205